Page 6

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 132, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.111 and 1.114 in response to the Final Office Action mailed on September 20, 2007.

4159848300

Summary of the Examiner's Action and Applicants' Response

The Examiner has again rejected Claims 8-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,845, "Wistendahl") in view of Lonnroth, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597, "Longroth"), and Bartok (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,553). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In this amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 8-11, 13, 19, and 26. The amendments to Claims 19 and 26 are to correct minor typographical errors. Claims 8-26 are pending.

Response to the Rejection of Claims 8-26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 8-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Lonnroth and Bartok. The Examiner acknowledged that "Wistendahl fails to disclose creating a template that defines an attribute assignable to hot spots and translating said hot spot and said attributes from said generic format into a first format prior to embedding."

In response to arguments in Applicants' last response, the Examiner stated regarding Claims 8 and 13 that map 104 in Bartok is a template which applies attributes "without regard to a specific hot spot (that is, prior to the paint operation performed by a user)". The Examiner stated that map 104 "associates a color index with a function". The Examiner stated that map 104 is a template that "enables an attribute to be associated with any arbitrary hot spot through the use of a straight forward paint operation by a user, where the template translates the color index value into an attribute, such as making a telephone call ... (Bartok, col. 13, lines 40-45)." The Examiner stated that the paint operation taught in Bartok allows the associated attribute to be associated with any arbitrary hot spot, as the subsequent association of the color index value with pixel values is applicable to any hot spot. The Examiner concluded in the rejection on page 5 of the Final Office Action that "[i]t would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Wistendahl to include using a created template to assign attribute information to a hot spot, as taught by Bartok, for the benefit of improved linking between screen

Page 7

objects and executable attributes that is more processor efficient". Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicants have amended Claim 8 herein to more clearly define the invention such that a geometric outline and a URL link specific to the hot spot are received from the user, but that all visual attributes of the hot spot, besides the geometric outline that defines the hot spot, are based solely on the template, i.e., not based on input from said user. More specifically, the method in Claim 8, as amended, includes providing a graphical user interface both "for receiving from the user a geometric outline defining a hot spot on said single video frame and for receiving a URL link for said hot spot". The method in Claim 8, as amended, includes "assigning at least one attribute to said hot spot based on said template, wherein all visual attributes of said hot spot, other than said geometric outline defining the hot spot, are assigned solely based on said template". Applicants respectfully submit that the geometric outline is merely the geometry of the hot spot. (See Page 11, lines 9-10, Page 17, lines 7-9). Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments are supported throughout the specification, as filed, e.g., page 17, lines 7-9.

Applicants respectfully submit that for the paint operation taught in Bartok, the user applies/designates a color for the hot spot. (Col. 13, lines 5-10 and 40-45). That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Bartok requires the user to perform a paint operation to paint the hot spot a particular color. In contrast, according to the method as claimed in Claim 8, "all visual attributes of said hot spot, other than said geometric outline, are assigned solely based on said template". Applicants respectfully submit that the method of Claim 8, as amended, bases visual attributes, other that the geometric outline, not on any user selection.

In contrast, Bartok teaches user selection of the color attribute, at least. Applicants respectfully submit that Bartok does not teach or suggest assigning all visual attributes, e.g., color, other than said geometric outline, based solely on said template, as claimed in Claim 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wistendahl, Bartok, or Lonnroth, either singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest providing a graphical user interface for receiving from the user a geometric outline defining a hot spot on said single video frame and for receiving a URL link for said hot spot; and assigning at least one attribute to said hot spot based on said template, wherein all visual attributes of said hot spot, other than said geometric outline, are assigned solely based on said template, as claimed in Claim 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that an advantage of the template according to an

Page 8

embodiment disclosed in the present specification is that "[b]y using a template, the author only needs to enter the specific information that is unique to each hot spot, namely the geometry of the hot spot and the link to which it refers." (Page 17, lines 7-9). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the template provides the advantage of simplifying hot spot creation by only having the user enter a geometric outline and a unique URL. (See also page 14, lines 28-32).

4159848300

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wistendahl, Bartok, or Lonnroth, either singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest the method as claimed in Claim 8.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 8 is non-obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Lonnroth and Bartok. Claims 9-11 have been amended for consistency with Claim 8. Claims 9-12 depend from Claim 8, and thus are respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Bartok and Lonnroth for the same reasons given above for Claim 8.

Claim 13 has been amended herein similarly to Claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wistendahl, Bartok, or Lonnroth, either singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest assigning at least one attribute to said hot spot based on said template, wherein all visual attributes of said hot spot, other than said geometric outline, are assigned solely based on said template, as claimed in Claim 13, for the same reasons given above for Claim 8. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wistendahl, Bartok, or Longroth, either singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest the assigning step combined with providing a graphical user interface for receiving from the user a geometric outline to defining a hot spot on said single video frame and for receiving a URL link for said hot spot, as claimed in Claim 13. Claim 13 is thus respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Bartok and Lonnroth for the same reasons given above for Claim 8.

Claims 14-26 depend from Claim 13, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that they are non-obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Bartok and Longroth for all the reasons given above for Claim 13.

Further regarding Claim 13, the Examiner stated that Wistendahl and Bartok fail to disclose translating the hot spot and the attributes from the generic format into a first format prior to embedding. The Examiner again stated that "Lonnroth, et al. teaches a method for translating client requested data into a format compatible with the client device (col. 3, lines 13-31) wherein content is converted into a format determined to be compatible with the requesting client prior to delivering

To: USPTO

Page 9

the content to the client (col.7, lines 40-50; col. 8, line 20 -col. 9 line 24), providing the benefit of allowing a single application to be compatible with many different types of clients (col. 10, lines 25-60)." The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by the combination of Wistendahl and Bartok by utilizing the above teaching of Longroth. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion to combine Lonnroth's teaching with the map 104 in Bartok as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that Lonnroth teaches transforming XML response documents, not a template and not translating done with the template. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the XML response documents in Lonnroth are based on XML request documents, which are documents created by a preprocessor in response to a service request, (See Col. 6, lines 48-52, and Col. 5, lines 44-50). Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 13 is non-obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Bartok and Lonnroth for these additional reasons. Claims 14-26 depend from Claim 13, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that they are non-obvious based on Wistendahl in view of Bartok and Longroth for the additional reasons given above for Claim 13.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims, Claims 8-26, in the present application are allowable. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (415) 984-8200.

Respectfully submitted.

James W. Drapinski

Registration No. 46,242

0 CT 31, 200

NIXON PEABODY LLP Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W Washington, D.C. 20004-2128

(415) 984-8200